

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 remain in this application. Claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added. Claims 15-20 have been withdrawn in response to the election of species requirement previously issued.

1. Election of Species

Applicant's acknowledge claims 1-14 were elected in the previous action. Applicant's remind Examiner that should pending claims 1-14 be deemed allowable, that Examiner should rejoin claims 15-20 into the case.

2. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,999,679 to Antos, et al. (Antos '679).

Respectfully, as now amended, the rejection is traversed. In particular, the further limitation that dispersion slope is negative at 1550 nm is added to claim 1. No such optical fiber exhibiting the combination of first and second moats with a negative total dispersion at 1550 nm, a negative dispersion slope at 1550 nm, and a kappa value, defined as total dispersion divided by dispersion slope at 1550 nm, of less than 75 nm is taught or suggested in Antos '679. The only negative dispersion slope examples in Antos '679 are taught in table 2, and none of those examples teach kappa of less than 75 nm as required in the claim. The lowest example with negative dispersion slope is Index 22 with a kappa of *about 117 nm*. Accordingly, the 102(b) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-14 should also be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

3. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antos '679.

As amended, the rejection of claim 8, which depends from claim 1, is also overcome. In particular, no such optical fiber exhibiting the combination of first and second moats with a negative total dispersion at 1550 nm, a negative dispersion slope at 1550 nm, and a kappa value, defined as total dispersion divided by dispersion slope at 1550 nm, of less than 75 nm is taught or suggested in Antos '679. Further, contrary to Examiner's statement that a limitation of a desired low pin array bend loss would be obvious, such is not the case. Achieving the combination of desired optical parameters as well as bend resistance is very difficult to achieve and extensive tradeoffs between the parameters must be undertaken to achieve all. Regarding Examiner's statements concerning enablement, desired ranges and numerous examples are provided which adequately enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the claimed invention. Accordingly, the 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

4. Reference Cited but Not Relied Upon

The references cited, but not relied upon by Examiner, are no more relevant to the claimed invention than those relied upon by Examiner.

5. Conclusion


Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe that **no extension of time** is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Randall S. Wayland at 607-974-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/2/06



Randall S. Wayland
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 36,303
Corning Incorporated
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831